

**REMARKS****Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 2, 4-7, 9, and 11-14 are withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention. Moreover, claims 1, 3, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,414,630 to Usui.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have canceled claims 2, 4-7, 9 and 11-14 without prejudice or disclaimer and have amended claims 1, 3, 8 and 10 to differently describe the invention. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 8 and 10 are presently pending.

**The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3, 8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Usui. To the extent that this rejection might be reapplied to the claims as newly-amended, it is respectfully traversed as follows.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed arrangements differ from the arrangement described in Usui for at least the following reasons. In the response filed on November 22, 2002, Applicants explained that independent claims 1 and 3 recite a “setting part for setting said other mobile vehicle either in a valid state or in an invalid state.” Applicants explained that this allows a user to select whether to disable or enable the display of a particular mobile vehicle at any particular time. Applicants pointed out that the Usui arrangement, on the other hand, differs from the claimed arrangement in that the identification data judgement means 6 will only allow

another mobile vehicle's information to be displayed to a user if the other mobile vehicle's information is predetermined identification information. Applicants explained that their claimed combinations go beyond this feature by allowing a user to enable and/or disable any of its predetermined other vehicle information at any particular time by setting the other mobile vehicle either in a valid state or in an invalid state via the user's input setting of the setting part.

At page 3 of the latest Office Action, the Examiner responds to these arguments by alleging that Applicants are not arguing the claim language "since the claims do not define that the user enables/disables or that such change is at any time."

In light of the Examiner's comments in this regard, and in an effort to advance the prosecution in this application, Applicants are newly-amending each of independent claims 1, 3, 8 and 10 to recite more detailed features regarding the setting part operation. In particular, each of independent claims 1 and 3 are newly-amended to recite "a setting part for allowing a user to set said other mobile vehicle either in a valid state or in an invalid state, in order to enable or disable said other mobile vehicle, at any particular time." Similarly, each of independent claims 8 and 10 are newly-amended to recite "setting said other mobile vehicle either in a valid state or in an invalid state via a setting operation which allows a user to enable or disable said other mobile vehicle at any particular time." Applicants respectfully submit that such amendments even further distinguish the claim(s) from the arrangement in Usui.

Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Usui does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 3, 8 and 10, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)."

### **Conclusions**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully Submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: November 3, 2003

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

**Customer No.: 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001